Recommendations by the Accreditation Team and Report of the Accreditation Visit for Professional Preparation Programs at California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo

Professional Services Division

June 16, 1998

Overview of This Report

This agenda report includes the findings of the Accreditation Team visit conducted at California Polytechic State University, San Luis Obispo. The report of the team presents the findings based upon reading the Institutional Self-Study Reports, review of supporting documentation and interviews with representative constituencies. On the basis of the report, an accreditation recommendation is made for the institution.

Accreditation Recommendations

(1) The Team recommends that, based on the attached Accreditation Team Report, the Committee on Accreditation make the following accreditation decision for California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo and all of its credential programs: **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Following are the stipulations:

- That the institution prepare for a focused re-visit within a one year time period to allow for interview of sufficient numbers of graduates, employers and candidates who are in the later stages of their programs. The purpose of these interviews is to assist the team in verifying candidate competence and other quality indicators in the Multiple and Single Subject credential programs and to review the status of the Multiple Subject Internship Program. (Development of new program documents is not required.)

- That the institution provide evidence that its system of program evaluation (including follow-up of graduates and employers) includes systematic summary and analysis of the data, and application of the findings to considerations for program development and/or modification. The plans for program development/modification should have an implementation timeline.

- That the institution review its allocation of resources to assure adequate faculty time for development and implementation of the new special education programs, for coordination and supervision within the single subject programs, to maintain faculty strength as existing faculty members retire or resign, and to provide for program growth.

- That the institution provide evidence that the BCLAD program provides coursework/preparation that assures that candidates develop the required skills

and competencies for teaching of subjects authorized by the credential and the communication skills, including reading.

On the basis of this recommendation, the institution is authorized to recommend candidates for the following Credentials:

- Administrative Services Credential
    Preliminary
    Preliminary Internship
    Professional

- Agricultural Specialist Credential

- Multiple Subject Credential
    CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish)
    CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish) Internship

- Pupil Personnel Services
    School Counseling

- Single Subject Credential

- Specialist in Special Education
    Learning Handicapped
    Severely Handicapped

(2) Staff recommends that:

- The institution's response to the preconditions be accepted.

- California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo be permitted to propose new credential programs for approval by the Committee on Accreditation.

- California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo be placed on the schedule of accreditation visits for the 2003-2004 academic year.

Background Information

California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo, boast a rich and colorful history. The institution was founded in 1901 as California Polytechnic School as a vocational high school Its purpose was "To furnish to young people of both sexes mental and manual training in the arts and sciences, including agriculture, mechanics, engineering, business methods, domestic economy, and such other branches as will fit the students for non-professional walks of life." During its first three decades Cal Poly evolved into the equivalent of a junior college. In 1933, Cal Poly got a new start. Julian A. McPhee, chief of the California Bureau of Agricultural Education, agreed to become the school's president. During the next 33 years, he guided Cal Poly's transformation.

A third year of instruction was added in 1936 and a fourth in 1940. In 1938, a branch campus was founded in Pomona. In 1947, the name was changed to California Polytechnic State College. In 1961, the college became a part of the newly formed California State Colleges system. The Pomona campus was made into a separate school in 1966. In 1972, the institution was renamed California Polytechnic State University (the Pomona institution is named California State Polytechnic University). As Cal Poly nears the end of its first century, it remains a continually evolving institution, but remains true to its original vision of a school to "teach the hand as well as the head."

The enrollment of the university is approximately 17,000 students. The admission process is highly competitive. For Fall 1997, 13,070 applied for 5,147 slots. Among the university's most "impacted" majors (those having the highest turn-down rate) are Liberal Studies and Human Development and Learning. These two majors account for most of the Cal Poly students who decide to become elementary teachers. The university is organized into six colleges that house nearly 50 academic departments; the College of Agriculture, the College of Architecture and Environmental Design, the College of Business, the College of Engineering, the College of Liberal Arts, and the College of Science and Mathematics. In addition, the University Center for Teacher Education is organized to promote an all-University approach toward teacher education.

The University Center for Teacher Education was in initiated in 1990, as a restructuring of the Department of Education, originally composed only of full-time education professors. The Center encompasses, in addition to fourteen full-time faculty, 17 faculty who participate with the UCTE and hold academic rank in a department outside of the center. In the winter quarter of 1998, 373 students were enrolled in the UCTE. Stressing the "learn by doing" philosophy of Cal Poly, the Center provides for extensive student on-site observation and fieldwork and has found that the motto fits well with the preparation of teachers, counselors and school administrators.

Preparation for the Accreditation Visit

The Commission staff consultant was assigned to the institution in Fall, 1996, and met with institutional leadership in Spring, 1997. There were consultant meetings with faculty, program directors and institutional administration. The meetings led to decisions about team size, team configuration, standards to be used, format for the institutional self-study report, interview schedule, logistical and organizational arrangements. In addition, telephone, e-mail and regular mail communication was maintained between the staff consultant and institutional representatives. The Team Leader, Dr. Lamar Mayer, was selected in November, 1997 and the team size agreement was signed in March 1997. On March 11, 1998, the consultant met with university personnel to make final determinations about the interview schedule, the template for the visit and any remaining organizational details.

Preparation of the Institutional Self-Study Report

The Institutional Self-Study Report was prepared beginning with responses to the Common Standards. These responses were developed in reference to all programs and for the unit as a whole. This was followed by separate responses to the Program Standards. For each program area, the institution decided which of the five options in the *Accreditation Framework* would be used for responses to the Program Standards. Institutional personnel decided to respond in all cases to the California Program Standards. The Specialist in Special Education program decided to use the new special education standards, even though the program has not yet been granted initial accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation. In addition, the Administrative Services Credential program was seeking initial accreditation under the new standards in addition to preparing for the accreditation visit.

Selection and Composition of the Accreditation Team

Decisions about the structure and size of the team were made cooperatively between the Director and Faculty of the University Center for Teacher Education and the Commission Consultant. It was agreed that there would be a team of twelve consisting of a Team Leader, a Common Standards Cluster of three members; a Basic Credential Cluster of four members; and an advanced Credential Cluster of four members. The Director and Consultant assigned each credential program to one of the program clusters. The Commission Consultant then selected the team members to participate in the visit. Team members were selected because of their expertise, experience and adaptability, and trained in the use of the *Accreditation Framework.* A little more than a week before the accreditation visit, a team member had to drop off of the team due to an unforseen schedule conflict. Because of the experienced members of the cluster and their wide range of expertise, the Director and the Consultant decided to not replace the team member and conduct the visit with eleven, rather than twelve team members.

The Common Standards Cluster examined primarily the University's responses to the Common Standards but also considered Program Standards issues for each credential area. Members of the Basic, Specialist, and Services Clusters primarily evaluated the institution's responses to the Program Standards for their respective areas but also considered Common Standards issues.

Intensive Evaluation of Program Data

Prior to the accreditation visit, team members received copies of the appropriate institutional reports and information from Commission staff on how to prepare for the visit. The on-site phase of the review began on Sunday, May 3, 1998. The team arrived on Sunday afternoon with a meeting of the entire team followed by organizational meetings of the clusters. The institution sponsored a reception on Sunday evening to provide an orientation to the institution.

On Monday and Tuesday, May 4 and 5, the team collected data from interviews and reviewed institutional documents according to procedures outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook.* There was extensive consultation among the members of all clusters, and much sharing of information. Lunch on Monday and Tuesday was spent sharing data that had been gathered from interviews and document review. The entire team met

on Monday evening to discuss progress the first day and share information about findings. Tuesday evening and Wednesday morning were set aside for additional team meetings and the writing of the team report. During those work sessions, cluster members shared and checked their data with members of other clusters and particularly with the Common Standards Cluster, since the Common Standards findings also affected each of the Program Clusters.

Mid-Visit Status Report

On Tuesday morning, the Team Leader and the Commission Consultant met with the Director to provide information about areas in which the team was seeking additional information which were discussed the previous evening. Early Tuesday afternoon, the Team Leader, the Cluster Leaders and the Commission Consultant met with the Director and the Program Coordinators to identify specific concerns arising from the interviews and the review of documents. The institution identified specific individuals who could provide information related to the concerns and made arrangements for the information to be presented to the team.

Preparation of the Accreditation Team Report

Pursuant to the *Accreditation Framework,* and the *Accreditation Handbook*, the team prepared a report using a narrative format. For each of the Common Standards, the team made a decision of "Standard Met" or "Standard Not Met." The team had the option of deciding that some of the Common Standards were "Met Minimally" with either Quantitative or Qualitative Concerns. The team then wrote specific narrative comments about each standard providing a finding or rationale for its decision and then outlining perceived Strengths or Concerns relative to the standard.

For each separate program area, the team prepared a narrative report about the program standards which pointed out any standards that were not met or not fully met and included explanatory information about findings related to the program standards. The team highlighted specific Strengths and Concerns related to the program areas.

The team included some "Professional Comments" at the end of the report for consideration by the institution. These comments are to be considered as consultative advice from the team members, but are not binding of the institution. They are not considered as a part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.

Accreditation Decision Making Activity

On Tuesday evening, the Clusters prepared summaries of each of their reports on chart paper which were posted on the walls of the team room. A separate chart was prepared for each Common Standard which noted the findings related to the standard, strengths, concerns and professional comments. For each program area, a separate chart was prepared summarizing the findings on the standards, strengths, concerns and professional comments. Team members had an opportunity to read all of the charts and add comments to them. Once that activity was completed, the Team Leader led in

a discussion of the various parts of the report, assisted by the appropriate Cluster Leaders.

For each of the Common Standards, the team made a consensus decision based upon the information on the charts and the discussion of the team. In like manner, the team discussed each program area and made decisions on the program standards. The discussion focused primarily on the Program Standards which were not fully met. The accreditation team recommendation options outlined in the *Accreditation Handbook* were discussed and clarified. On the basis of the entire discussion the team made a tentative accreditation decision. After considerable discussion, the team decided that "Accreditation with Substantive Stipulations" was the appropriate decision and identified the areas in which stipulations were appropriate. The information on the charts was then used to prepare the final report.

On Wednesday morning, the team finished its writing, met for a final review of the report and re-confirmed the decision of the prior evening. The staff consultant compiled the parts of the report into a single document in order to present it to the faculty of the university. The Team Leader and the Consultant met with the Director to discuss the report while copies were being made for the team and the faculty and staff. The report was presented to the assembled faculty and staff on Tuesday afternoon by the Team Leader, with appropriate comments by the Cluster Leaders and the Staff Consultant.

**CALIFORNIA COMMISSION ON TEACHER CREDENTIALING
COMMITTEE ON ACCREDITATION - ACCREDITATION TEAM REPORT**

Institution: **California Polytechnic State University, San Luis Obispo**

Dates of Visit: **May 3-6, 1998**

**Accreditation Team
Recommendation:** **ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS**

Rationale:
The recommendation of the accreditation team for ACCREDITATION WITH SUBSTANTIVE STIPULATIONS was based on a thorough review of the self study documents presented to the team members, review of the exhibits provided in the documents room, and interviews with campus personnel, field (school) personnel, candidates, and graduates. Team members experienced considerable difficulty with the schedule of interviews and consequently were unable to see as many program candidates and program graduates as they needed to make judgments on all of the programs. Many of the available candidates were new in the programs or were still in pre-requisite classes. The number of graduates interviewed ranged from 4 to 10 in the different credential programs. Thus, a definitive determination of candidate competence in several of the programs was difficult.

Common Standards: Four of the Common Standards were judged to have been met (#'s 1, 3, 6 and 7); three standards were judged to have been met minimally with quantitative concerns (#'s 2, 5, and 8); and one standard was judged to have been met minimally with qualitative concerns (#4). These judgments were based on the fact that an effective, comprehensive system of program evaluation that results in program revision and development has not been implemented. Some evaluative data has been gathered, but there has not been appropriate summary, analysis, and implementation of findings. While admission procedures generally are working well, there was a major problem with admission and supervision of individuals in the internship program. Also, a system for selecting, training, and evaluation of field supervisors has been developed, but there has been no consistent implementation of the program across all credential areas.

Program Standards: All program standards were judged to be met in the following programs:
  Agriculture Specialist Credential Program
  Administrative Services Credential Programs
  Pupil Personnel Services Credential Program

Due to the transitional status of the Specialist Credential Programs in Special Education and the requirements for new program development, a traditional review was not feasible. Recommendations for a short-term continued accreditation of existing programs are made in order to allow students to finish their current programs. Further, the institution must develop new programs for initial accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation if the institution plans to continue to offer the credential programs.

Stipulations are recommended related to the Common Standards and for the basic credential programs (Multiple Subject, including Internship, and Single Subject). As previously stated, part of the reason for this recommendation relates to the lack of sufficient information from interviews.

Following are the stipulations recommended by the accreditation team:

- That the institution prepare for a focused re-visit within a one year time period to allow for interview of sufficient numbers of graduates, employers and candidates who are in the later stages of their programs. The purpose of these interviews is to assist the team in verifying candidate competence and other quality indicators in the Multiple and Single Subject credential programs and to review the status of the Multiple Subject Internship Program. (Development of new program documents is not required.)

- That the institution provide evidence that its system of program evaluation (including follow-up of graduates and employers) includes systematic summary and analysis of the data, and application of the findings to considerations for program development and/or modification. The plans for program development/modification should have an implementation timeline.

- That the institution review its allocation of resources to assure adequate faculty time for development and implementation of the new special education programs, for coordination and supervision within the single subject programs, to maintain faculty strength as existing faculty members retire or resign, and to provide for program growth.

- That the institution provide evidence that the BCLAD program provides coursework/preparation that assures that candidates develop the required skills and competencies for teaching of subjects authorized by the credential and the communication skills, including reading.

Team Leader: **C. Lamar Mayer**
California State University, Los Angeles

Common Standards Cluster:
Rosemary Fahey, Cluster Leader
Chapman University

Honoruth Finn
Gilroy Unified School District (on leave)

Jody Daughtry
California State University, Fresno

Basic Credential Cluster:
Beverly L. Young, Cluster Leader
California State University, Chancellor's Office

Art Parham
California State University, Fresno

Stacie Curry
Fowler Unified School District

Peggy Dawson
Los Alamitos Unified School District

Advanced Credential Cluster:
Bruce Simmerok, Cluster Leader
Azusa Pacific University

M. Clifford Cole
Orange Unified School District

Judy Mantle
National University

DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

University Catalog
Institutional Self Study
Course Syllabi
Candidate Files
Fieldwork Handbooks
Follow-up Survey Results
Needs Analysis Results
Information Booklets
Field Experience Notebooks
Schedule of Classes
Advisement Documents
Faculty Vitae

Student Handbooks

INTERVIEWS CONDUCTED

	Tm Ldr/ Comm	MS/SS	Agric. Spec.	Spec. Ed.	Pupil Pers. Serv.	Admin. Serv.	TOTAL
Program Faculty	9	45	6	8	16	6	90
Institutional Administration	5	2		1	1	1	10
Pre-Requisite Students		113					113
Candidates	20	76	32	17	17	28	190
Graduates	6	12	10	4	5	6	43
Employers of Graduates	2	9	2	1	4	4	22
Supervising Practitioners	6	35	3	2	6	3	55
Advisors		4	5	1	6	3	19
School Administrators	8	3	1	6	5	2	25
Credential Analyst	2						2
Advisory Committee	4	8	2	1	1	10	26

TOTAL   **595**

Common Standards

Standard 1 - Education Leadership   **Standard Met**

The mission of the University Center for Teacher Education is focused on "...providing leadership for collaboration within the university and between Cal Poly and public schools" on the central coast of California. Through active participation in the National Network for Educational Renewal for the past five years, UCTE is committed to the principles of John Goodlad with regard to the "renewal of schools and the education of educators."

Reporting relationships of positions and UCTE committees are clearly delineated. The current UCTE structure provides ongoing opportunities for participative management and decision-making through program meetings. Each credential program is led by a coordinator elected by the faculty every two years. A leadership team which includes the UCTE Director and Coordinators from the three UCTE divisions, graduate, multiple and single subject meets bimonthly.

Strengths

The UCTE leadership team indicates strength in its collegial relationship between the Director, faculty and staff members and opportunities for shared decision making.

Concerns

The lack of attention to the effective operation of the internship program is especially significant and the management of this program was clearly ineffective.

Standard 2 - Resources   **Standard Met Minimally**
                                              with Quantitative Concerns

The team finds that most credential programs have generally adequate resources. However, questions arise about the allocation of resources including:

- Number of faculty working full time within the Single Subject program
- Replacement faculty for retired personnel to Pupil Personnel Services
- Classroom space for UCTE
- Library and media resources for graduate students and adjunct faculty
- Curriculum materials

There is insufficient allocation of faculty time and resources for developing new programs in special education.

Strengths

The faculty drawn from other colleges within the university to work with UCTE in training single subject candidates provides strong academic expertise as well as the close connection of methods to academic disciplines in classroom instruction.

Concerns
Scheduling of academic classes and UCTE classes at the same time forces students to miss part of each class.

Instruction in the use of technology for disabled students does not appear to be available.

Retiring faculty, faculty on leave and faculty on sabbatical are not replaced in a timely manner.

Standard 3 - Faculty   **Standard Met**
Well qualified persons are assigned to teach courses within the Cal Poly UCTE. Faculty are involved in the recruitment and hiring of other faculty. UCTE regularly evaluates the performance of course instructors. Students are assigned for advisement to faculty with appropriate backgrounds and professional experience. Many full time faculty in UCTE have responsibilities for field supervision.

All part time faculty members must be part of the UCTE lecturer pool. Faculty candidates are recruited annually to this pool.

Strengths
UCTE coordinates teaching and advising responsibilities with center faculty in the academic disciplines of math, life science, English, physical education and political and social science, physical science and agricultural education.

Course evaluations are used in UCTE to make needed curricular modifications.

Concerns
Through interviews of faculty and students, it was indicated that a consistent process for evaluating training and developing field supervisors is needed.

In the PPS and Ed Administration programs there is a felt need to maintain a balance between full time and adjunct faculty.

Standard 4 - Evaluation   **Standard Met Minimally**
                                                  with Qualitative Concerns
UCTE gathers and compiles a great deal of data from program participants, graduates, practitioners, and employers for evaluation. However, data has not been analyzed nor have conclusions been drawn in a manner which would result in effecting systematic change in program design or content.

Strengths
UCTE has many informal mechanisms for eliciting evaluative data.

The PPS program has a strong advisory committee that contributes to the evaluation of that program.

Concerns

There is very limited evidence of program changes based upon data collected.

There is a lack of data-based decision making on program effectiveness in the Educational Administration, Pupil Personnel Services, and Special Education programs.

The team found limited evaluative data collected for the intern program.

There is no record of meaningful, relevant, and regular advisory processes for the new special education program.

Standard 5 - Admission   **Standard Met Minimally**
                                                    with Quantitative Concerns
Well-defined admission criteria and procedures have been developed in the UCTE for each credential program with above the median GPA standards calculated for comparable populations of students at Cal Poly. Criteria do include interviews, writing samples and recommendations. Candidates meet with advisors in their specific subject credential programs to apply to the program and to be informed about prerequisites as well as requirements.

Strengths
The Professional Aptitude Interview (P.A.I.) in the UCTE is a comprehensive screening process for admission which is accompanied by further review of the UCTE program team.

Concerns
Efforts for recruitment of students from under-represented populations need to be further developed. The current candidate pool is not diverse enough.

Former interns indicated that insufficient attention was paid to prior experience in selection procedures.

Standard 6 - Advice and Assistance   **Standard Met**
In general, students have a clear understanding of program requirements. They know who is responsible for advisement within their programs and have reasonable access to these advisors.

Program information is available in a variety of printed materials. Group advisement takes place both within classes and at periodic group advising meetings or workshops. Career placement services are provided by Career Services including classroom presentations, workshops, job fairs, and e-mailed vacancy announcements.

Strengths
Students perceive faculty as available and very willing to assist students with academic and professional concerns.

Concerns
No evidence indicated that individual plans for support and professional development of interns were formulated.

Interviews with reentry students indicated needs for additional support services
Advising services are not readily available in the evening.

The transition between the old and new special education program has created some confusion regarding program requirements.

Students reported lack of communication between the UCTE and other campus units such as university admissions.

Standard 7 - School Collaboration   **Standard Met**
The UCTE effectively collaborates with districts over a broad region, involving district and site administrators and teachers in program planning and implementation.

Effective collaborative efforts include the following:

University faculty and students in the COPS (National Network for Educational Renewal) program have close working relationships with school faculty and students.

Service credential programs involve local practitioners as adjunct faculty and supervisors.

Special Education candidates and university supervisors have positive relationships through their own network within the county. Agricultural specialist credential candidates network on a statewide basis with university and state personnel.

A comprehensive multiple subjects handbook for university faculty, students and school faculty addresses the continuum--admissions through student teaching and credentialing--and is available to all participants. An abbreviated handbook for single subject candidates also exists.

Strengths
The partnership fostered by the National Network for Educational Renewal has resulted in the establishment of a Partner School Teacher in Residence. This program is co-sponsored by the UCTE and districts belonging to the Coalition of Partner Schools. UCTE funds pay participating districts the cost of a teacher to replace the Partner School. School faculties and university faculty members are truly partners in the preparation of student teachers.

Concerns
There are minimal standards for the selection of traditional school sites in placing student teachers.

A more systematic communication between traditional schools and the university needs to be developed.

Formal communication between adjunct faculty and full time faculty should be increased.

Collaboration is lacking in the selection of master teachers.

Standard 8 - Field Supervisors **Standard Met Minimally**
with Quantitative Concerns

Field supervisor selection procedures vary from program to program and within programs as well. In some cases, the university plays a minimal role in the selection of qualified master teachers, allowing school principals or other district personnel to be entirely responsible for master teacher selection. Criteria for the selection of master teachers are minimal and some individuals charged with the selection of master teachers are not aware of these criteria.

Although training in supervision is available, it is not mandatory at this point in time. Consequently, some master teachers have had little or no supervisory training. It should be noted, however, that students are generally positive regarding their field supervisors' coaching skills. Information contained in program handbooks and initial meetings between university supervisors and field supervisors help to orient field supervisors to their role. In the basic credential programs, a system for evaluating master teachers has been developed but not fully implemented. Rewards and recognition for field supervisors could be expanded.

Strengths
The newly developed master teacher training was perceived to be worthwhile by program participants.

Some field supervisors are judged by candidates to be very good.

Concerns
Interns reported that they were not supervised in the field.

Multiple Subject CLAD/BCLAD Emphasis (Spanish), Credential Programs, Including Internship

Findings on Standards

After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews of candidates, faculty, and supervising practitioners, the team determined that all program standards in Categories I and II were fully met with the exceptions of Standards 5, 8, and 20, which were minimally met with qualitative concerns. Additionally, due to the inadequate number of opportunities to interview program graduates and employers, a determination regarding Standards 10 through 19 in Category III was not able to be made.

Standard 5*: Minimally met with qualitative concerns* --For BCLAD multiple subject candidates, there is not sufficient opportunity provided to acquire knowledge and skills specific to teaching students from linguistically diverse backgrounds.

Finding: The structure of the BCLAD credential coursework does not provide adequate and specific opportunity for acquisition of specialized knowledge, skills, and abilities relevant to the teaching authorized by the BCLAD credential.

Standard 8*: Minimally met with qualitative concerns* --Inconsistent levels of guidance, assistance, and feedback are provided to student teachers through institutional supervision of student teaching.

Finding: While some sites have supervision provided on a weekly or semi-weekly basis, including conferences with the candidate and master teacher, other sites have limited supervisorial visits and feedback offered via later conference or one-way written notes only.

Standard 20*: Minimally met with qualitative concerns*--Inconsistent evaluation of candidates, by both university supervisors and master teachers.

Finding: Inconsistent documentation of the assessment and evaluation of candidate competence was available. There were varying reports as to the procedures followed, standards to determine competence, and expectations of responsibilities. There was also conflicting evidence presented as to the University's role in counseling out candidates who may not have been making acceptable progress toward competency.

Standards 10-19: There was insufficient evidence provided for the team to make a determination in regard to these standards.

Finding: Only 7 multiple subject graduates and 5 site administrators were available for interview. The team found that in general, those familiar with the program were satisfied with candidate competence, but the team was unable to make specific determination as to each specific standard on the basis of the evidence available.

Strengths

There was widespread appreciation for the strength of the Center's leadership provided by the Director.

Several school personnel reported that their students feel a real connection with Cal Poly as "their University", due in large part to many faculty who come to schools for special presentations or projects.

The collaborative nature and structure of the Teacher-In-Residence Program is commended for a positive contribution to the program and to the credibility of the University program.

The organizational structure that results in meaningful involvement by subject matter faculty in the teacher education program.

Multiple Subject candidates have a strong preparation in the content areas of science and mathematics.

Concerns
The team had a concern in relation to the field experiences prior to student teaching. It was not entirely clear that students are supervised and assessed in their field experiences, and that this information is utilized to make a determination as to their readiness to advance to student teaching.

There were numerous concerns expressed as to the adequacy of the Spanish language preparation and fluency of candidates in the BCLAD program.

Evidence existed that some multiple subject student teachers were placed in one school site for both of their placements, mostly in response to student request. In some cases, this resulted in the entire student teaching experience occuring in a school environment that was lacking sufficient diversity in student ethnicity, language ability, and socio-economic status. This is an especially important concern with student teachers who are receiving CLAD credentials.

Additionally, even with the lack of sufficient evidence regarding Standards 10 through 19, there was concern about the adequacy of candidate preparation in the areas of teaching reading (including sufficient knowledge and skills in a balanced approach to reading and language arts), and in candidate's preparation and abilities to assess and evaluate students.

In terms of the Multiple Subject Intern program, the team had serious concerns in almost every standard area as to conflicting evidence regarding meeting standards when the program was in operation last year. Since the program is no longer in operation, the team's professional decision was to not include these concerns in the determination regarding standards for the other CLAD and BCLAD Multiple Subject programs.

Single Subject Credential Program

Findings on Standards
After review of the institutional report, supporting documentation, the completion of interviews of candidates, faculty, and supervising practitioners, the team determined

that all program standards in Categories I and II were fully met with the exceptions of Standards 8 and 20, which were minimally met with qualitative concerns. Additionally, due to the inadequate number of opportunities to interview program graduates and employers, a determination regarding Standards 10 through 19 in Category III was not able to be made.

Standard 8*: Minimally met with qualitative concerns* **--**Inconsistent levels of guidance, assistance, and feedback are provided to student teachers through institutional supervision of student teaching.

Finding: While some student teachers have supervision provided on a weekly or semi-weekly basis, including conferences with the candidate and master teacher, other student teachers have limited supervisorial visits and feedback offered via later conference or one-way written notes only.

Standard 20*: Minimally met with qualitative concerns--Inconsistent evaluation of candidates, by both university supervisors and master teachers.*

Finding: Inconsistent documentation of the assessment and evaluation of candidate competence was available. There were varying reports as to the procedures followed, standards to determine competence, and expectations of responsibilities.

Standards 10-19: There was insufficient evidence provided for the team to make a determination in regard to these standards.

Finding: Only 5 single subject graduates and 1 site administrator were available for interview. The team found that in general, those familiar with the program were satisfied with candidate competence, but the team was unable to make specific determination as to each specific standard on the basis of the evidence available.

Strengths
There was widespread appreciation for the strength of the Center's leadership provided by the Director.

The commitment to place secondary candidates in both middle and high school settings for student teachers is commended.

The specific credential area of Agricultural Education was found to be particularly strong, meeting all program standards and producing candidates perceived to be competent by all stakeholders.

The organizational structure results in meaningful involvement by subject matter faculty in the teacher education program.

Concerns
Additionally, the team had a concern in relation to the field experiences prior to student teaching. It was not entirely clear that students are supervised and assessed in their field experiences, and that this information is utilized to make a determination as to their readiness to advance to student teaching.

Agricultural Specialist Credential

Findings on Standards/Guidelines:
Based on the evidence found in the documents reviewed and interviews with faculty, candidates, master teachers, and principals, we find the Agricultural Specialist Program to have met all standards specific to this program.

Strengths:
Outstanding rapport between students and faculty is a hallmark of this program. Master teacher selection, training, and performance was found to be a strength. The Ag Specialist Advisory Committee meets regularly and discusses the big issues for the program; consequently, improvements are routinely made. The application of technology is widespread in this program and should be commended.

Concerns:
Survey documentation for curriculum improvement was marginal. A survey of administrators and employers was not done by UCTE. Because the Agricultural Education population is widespread geographically and distinct from the population in the Cal Poly vicinity, it should be surveyed and analyzed separately.

Preliminary Level I Education Specialist Credential Programs
(LH/SH Programs)

Findings on Standards

The Special Education programs at Cal Poly are in transition from the old programs (Learning Handicapped and Severely Handicapped) based on guidelines, to new programs (Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe) based on standards. The old programs are still operating and the new programs are in the final stages of development, but are not yet recommended for initial accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation. Because of this interim situation, the accreditation team was not able to develop findings related specifically to the new standards. Rather, the team reviewed the existing programs using its professional knowledge of the old guidelines and information from the new standards.

The team finds the current special education programs to be fully acceptable to continue recommending candidates for the LH and SH credentials, as currently authorized. Cal Poly will not be permitted to admit students into the old programs after June 30, 1998. The University is in the process of submitting its program proposal under the new standards, and will be authorized to admit students as soon as the proposal is recommended by the review panel and granted initial accreditation by the Committee on Accreditation. Further, the team has prepared some Professional Comments about the new proposal to provide a formative evaluation as the proposal is being modified.

Strengths

The following were noted by the team as particular strengths of the program:

1. Field work attached to the coursework was perceived by students and graduates as a strength of the program.

2. Multiple methods of classroom presentation were acknowledged by several students and graduates as strengths of the program.

3. Faculty are well qualified as demonstrated by the degrees and multiple credentials that they hold, and by the many positive comments made by current students and graduates of the program.

Concerns

After reviewing all available information and completing interviews across multiple constituencies, the team identified the following as concerns in the Special Education programs:

1. There is a high level of frustration in students in this period of transition between the current and the new programs.

2. There was a variance in the number of supervisor visits, and the timing of those visits, among field experience students.

3. When faculty have other assignments and are on leave, there is a lack of availability of some courses.

Preliminary Administrative Services Credential (including Internship) and Professional Administrative Services Credential

Findings on Standards
After the review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduates, faculty, employers, advisory committee members and field experience supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Preliminary Administrative Credential and the Professional Administrative Services Credential. While the Preliminary Administrative Credential with Internship has been approved, it does not currently have students enrolled in the program. The programs are dynamically evolving programs that address new CTC standards attempting to deal with the diversity needs of a changing community. They have developed close partnerships with local school district and county office personnel to prepare administrators to meet the diverse needs of the area. The program is an appropriate blend of theory and practice culminating in strong mentoring relationships with professionals in the field.

Strengths
The following were noted by the team as particular strengths of the program:

1. There is evidence of a commitment of faculty to create a strong relationship with the community by meeting regularly with a variety of groups of professional school administrators.

2. The advisory committee meets on a regular basis with a clear agenda and members express confidence that their deliberations will have an impact on the program and the quality of the administrators produced by the program.

3. The infusion of technology across the program is to be commended as an effort to assure that candidates will enter the field with knowledge and skills to function in the rapidly changing world of information management.

4. Requirements are established to assure that a portion of each candidate's field experiences are in a location provides exposure to diversity in preparation for a variety of line and staff administrative employment opportunities.

Concerns
The team identified the following as some concerns for consideration:

1. While candidates are given opportunities to experience diversity, further consideration should be given to recruiting a larger cross section of the population into the program to have a greater impact on the changing needs of the community.

2. Care should be taken to meet to needs of non-partnership schools when assigning students to field experiences.

Pupil Personnel Services Credential Programs: School Counseling

Findings on Standards
After the review of the institutional report and supporting documentation and the completion of interviews with candidates, graduate, faculty, employers, advisory committee members and field experience supervisors, the team determined that all program standards are met for the Pupil Personnel Services: School Counseling program. The team found that there was a curricular initiative to utilize adjuncts with diverse backgrounds. Additionally, students have access to and are trained technology used by school counselors. Candidates receive support from faculty on advisement questions throughout their program. Since the University Center for Teacher Education (UCTE) originated, collaboration between faculty, staff and students has improved.

Strengths
Strengths of the program include successful special programs, i.e. Coalition of Partnership Schools (COPS) and Advancement Via Individual Determination. (AVID). Legal and ethical concerns are integrated throughout the curriculum. Full-time staff is most helpful. An "At-risk" emphasis, added since the last accreditation, has proven to be a needed and successful addition.

Concerns
The cluster is concerned that there is a lack of contact and little written communication among its full time and adjunct faculty. Secondly, too much theory and too little practice is evidenced. There is uneven curriculum strength.

Professional Comments

(These comments and observations from the team are only for the use of the institution. They are to be considered as consultative advice from team members, but are not binding on the institution. They are not considered part of the accreditation recommendation of the team.)

Common Standards Cluster

Consider requiring all university and field supervisors to attend at least one workshop on supervisory methods or to verify that they have had some type of formal supervision training.

Consider making student attendance at a group "advising" workshop mandatory. The current workshops for the multiple and single subject students are highly informative, but not all students choose to attend.

Consider seeking ways to assure the continued support of the NNER Partner School Teacher in Residence program as it expands.

Basic Credential Cluster (Multiple Subject)

Candidates should receive careful advisement as to the appropriateness of the intern option for each individual. When students are allowed to pursue this option without sufficient preparation, it can result in their disillusionment with the teaching profession while still a novice. Students should be assisted in the determination of their own readiness to even consider this option.

There is some perception in the field that some faculty members are out of date in many areas (balanced approach to reading, teaching strategies other than the Hunter model), and that are "out of touch" with real K-12 classrooms. Faculty may wish to pursue greater involvement in schools, and perhaps including demonstration lessons for student and master teachers at school sites.

Some faculty are described as not utilizing the strategies and methods they describe in delivering instruction in their own classes at the University. Additionally, in order to increase the perceived relevance of the curriculum, field practitioners could be invited more frequently to participate in classes.

It may not be perceived as a real commitment to diversity when students are allowed to "opt out" of teaching in the most diverse student environments. These decisions should be made by the University, not the student, in terms of what will prove to be the most valuable experience for each candidate.

Incorporation of a cohort structure, especially in the student teaching portion of the program, may add elements of student group support and cohesiveness.

School personnel would really value a greater effort to coordinate student teacher placement with the school site calendar, particularly if it allowed student teachers to participate in the opening of the school year.

Basic Credential Cluster (Single Subject)

There is some perception in the field that faculty are out of date in many areas and are "out of touch" with real K-12 classrooms. Faculty may wish to pursue greater involvement in schools, perhaps including demonstration lessons for student and master teachers at school sites.

Faculty are often described as not utilizing the strategies and methods they describe in delivering instruction in their own classes at the University. Additionally, in order to increase the perceived relevance of the curriculum, field practitioners could be invited more frequently to participate in classes.

Incorporation of a cohort structure, especially in the student teaching portion of the program, may add elements of student group support and cohesiveness.

School personnel would really value a greater effort to coordinate student teacher placement with the school site calendar, particularly if it allowed student teachers to participate in the opening of the school year.

Basic Credential Cluster (Agricultural Specialist)
It appears a student advising problem may have been relieved by the program handbook recently distributed. Care should be taken to monitor the effectiveness and use of the handbook.

Advanced Credential Cluster (Education Specialist)
Recommendations for strengthening the <u>Learning Handicapped and Severely Handicapped Specialist Programs</u> are as follows:

1. In order to strengthen the vitality of the program, expand recruitment efforts for the Special Education programs, especially the Severely Handicapped Specialist credential program.

2. In order to reduce frustration, design a clear advisement system for the new Special Education programs in collaboration with the Credential Analysts, who can assist significantly with the dissemination of information.

3. Strengthen the "technology for the disabled" component so that students can better integrate those technologies into their teaching methodologies.

4. Include adjunct faculty members and master teachers in faculty meetings with full-time faculty members whenever possible.

5. Continue to strengthen the diversity component of all aspects of the program (faculty, students, curriculum, student teaching placements) to the maximum degree possible.

Recommendations for developing the new <u>Mild/Moderate and Moderate/Severe Preliminary Level I Credential programs</u> include the following:

1. Design a Student Teaching Handbook which clearly articulates all requirements and assignments with designated populations, procedures, processes, and assessment and verification forms. The system and schedule for Supervisor visits should be included, along with the responsibilities for all involved parties. Forms for evaluating the experience by all parties should be included.

2. Design Field Experience Handbooks for each respective experience which includes the same elements identified in the previous item.

3. Develop a revised Student Teaching Evaluation Form which incorporates information from the California Professional Teaching Standards and the new Special Education Standards.

4. Provide clear documentation of advisory board recommendations from multiple meetings and how those recommendations influenced the development of the program.

5. Provide an analysis of program evaluation data and explain how the data influenced program development.

6. Develop a comprehensive grid which cross-references the courses with the program standards.

7. Summarize the major course products and student assignments by course.

8. Separate and tab course syllabi in an appendix. Include professional references with the course syllabi.

9. Clearly demonstrate how candidate competence will be determined in meeting each standard, i. e., procedures, processes, and means of assessment which assure candidate competence.

10. Incorporate program evaluation processes, procedures and forms into the program document since program evaluation provides a major avenue to determine assurances that candidates have demonstrated proficiency across all of the standards. These forms and processes need to correspond with the new program.

Advanced Credential Cluster (Administrative Services)
The Advisory Committee raised a question about the program not having a budget. Effort should be made to inform them of the structure of the budget for the UCTE, which is not currently structured by program. The procedure to request funding for projects or program modifications could be explored to created more of a feeling of ownership and accountability as the committee continues.

Advanced Credential Cluster (Pupil Personnel Services)
Of special note is the progress in the increasing number of ethnically diverse students enrolled in the program. The fact that a local district must go out of the Cal-Poly service area for research assistance is troubling. Finally, and most appreciated, is the ability of

professors to recommend students for admission who fall below regular admission criteria.